

Title: **Electromagnet Technical
Evaluation Strategy Report**

Unique Identifier: **15ENG GEN-2170**

Alternative Reference Number: **N/A**

Area of Applicability: **Tutuka**

Documentation Type: **Report**

Revision: **1**

Total Pages: **9**

Next Review Date: **N/A**

Disclosure Classification: **CONTROLLED
DISCLOSURE**

Compiled by



S Nene
System Engineer

Functional Responsibility



T Modungwa
**Electrical Engineering
Manager**

Authorised by



N Ngcobo
Engineering Manager

Date: 11/08/2021.....

Date: 2021-08-11.....

Date: 16/08/2021.....

CONTENTS

	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES	3
2.1 SCOPE	3
2.1.1 Purpose	3
2.1.2 Applicability	3
2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES	3
2.2.1 Normative	3
2.2.2 Informative	3
2.3 DEFINITIONS	3
2.3.1 Classification	3
2.4 ABBREVIATIONS	4
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	4
2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING	4
2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS	4
3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY	4
3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD	4
3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD	5
3.3 TET MEMBERS	5
3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	5
3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA	6
3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES	7
A. FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS	8
3.6.1 Risks	8
3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions	8
4. AUTHORISATION	9
5. REVISIONS	9
6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM	9
7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	9

TABLES

Table 1: TET Members	5
Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria	5
Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria	6
Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities	7

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

1. INTRODUCTION

The need has been acknowledged for the procurement of new Electromagnet.

2. SUPPORTING CLAUSES

2.1 SCOPE

The scope of this document is to capture the technical tender evaluation strategy for procurement of new Electromagnet at Tutuka Power Station.

2.1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the tender technical evaluation strategy is to define the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria, Qualitative Evaluation Criteria and TET member responsibilities for tender technical evaluation. The technical evaluation strategy serves as basis for the tender technical evaluation process.

2.1.2 Applicability

This document applies to the Tender Evaluation Team for the procurement of new electromagnet at Tutuka Power Station.

2.2 NORMATIVE/INFORMATIVE REFERENCES

Parties using this document shall apply the most recent edition of the documents listed in the following paragraphs.

2.2.1 Normative

- [1] 240-48929482 : Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure
- [2] 240-55864553 : Magnetic Separators and Metal Detectors standard

2.2.2 Informative

- [3] NA

2.3 DEFINITIONS

2.3.1 Classification

Controlled Disclosure: Controlled Disclosure to external parties (either enforced by law, or discretionary)

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

2.4 ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Description
LV	Low voltage
SHEQ	Safety, Health, Environment and Quality
EMD	Electrical Maintenance Department
ISO	International Standard Organisation
TET	Technical Evaluation Team

2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

As per 240-48929482: Tender Technical Evaluation Procedure

2.6 PROCESS FOR MONITORING

2.7 RELATED/SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

N/A

3. TENDER TECHNICAL EVALUATION STRATEGY

3.1 TECHNICAL EVALUATION METHOD

The evaluation of the tender submission will be based on mandatory and qualitative evaluation criteria. This is to determine the tenderer's ability to meet the Technical requirements. A weighted score card approach will be used to evaluate the tender submission against the standards/specifications and Employer's requirements.

Score	%	Definition
5	100	COMPLIANT Meet technical requirement(s) AND; No foreseen technical risk(s) in meeting technical requirements.
4	80	COMPLIANT WITH ASSOCIATED QUALIFICATIONS Meet technical requirement(s) with; Acceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR;

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

		Acceptable exceptions AND/OR; Acceptable conditions.
2	40	NON-COMPLIANT Does not meet technical requirement(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable technical risk(s) AND/OR; Unacceptable exceptions AND/OR; Unacceptable conditions.
0	0	TOTALLY DEFICIENT OR NON-RESPONSIVE
<p>Note 1: The scoring table does not allow for scoring of 1 and 3.</p> <p>Note 2: Foreseen acceptable and unacceptable risk(s), exceptions and conditions shall be unambiguously defined in the relevant Tender Technical Evaluation Strategy.</p>		

3.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION THRESHOLD

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for a tender to be considered from a technical perspective is 70%.

3.3 TET MEMBERS

Table 1: TET Members

TET number	TET Member Name	Designation
TET 1	Sabelo Nene	Electrical Engineering System Engineer
TET 2	Lucas Thobejane	Electrical Engineering Senior Engineer
TET 3	Cedric Gumede	Electrical Maintenance Senior Supervisor
TET 4	Sekese Maema	Mechanical Maintenance Senior Supervisor
TET 5	Tom Xaba	Auxiliary Engineering Senior Advisor

3.4 MANDATORY TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

In accordance with 240-48929482, an assessment of 'NO' against any criterion referenced # 1 to 2 in Table 2 shall disqualify the assessed tenderer from further Qualitative Evaluation.

Table 2: Mandatory Technical Evaluation Criteria

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

Ref #	Mandatory Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification /Tender Returnable	Motivation for use of Criteria
1.	The tenderer to supply equipment that complies with the standard for the Magnetic Separators and Metal Detectors:240-55864553	Written confirmation letter	To ensure proper equipment is reliable and of acceptable quality.

3.5 QUALITATIVE TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

In accordance with 240-48929482, tenders that have met all the Mandatory Evaluation Criteria will be evaluated against the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria defined in Table 3 below. The scoring of qualitative criteria shall be based on the degree of achievement by the tenderer to meet the technical requirements defined in Table 3. Each item shall have the specific sub-weighting criteria that shall be scored in accordance with Table 2 of 240-48929482.

The minimum weighted final score (threshold) required for the tenderer to be considered FUNCTIONALLY ACCEPTABLE from a technical perspective is 70%.

The recommendation on the highest technically ranked tenderer shall be based on the final scoring comparisons and the tenderer with the highest score shall be recommended from a technical perspective, if the weighted final score exceeds the defined threshold.

Table 3: Qualitative Technical Evaluation Criteria

Criteria Ref #	Qualitative Technical Criteria Description	Reference to Technical Specification / Tender Returnable	Criteria Weighting	Score	Sub - Criteria Weighting (%)
1.	The new electromagnet to be 100% interchangeable(Electrical and mechanical) with currently installed	Tender returnable	100% interchangeable	5	80

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

		Tender returnable	Motor KW not the same as existing	4	
		Tender returnable	Not fitting in the plant	2	
2.	Delivery period	Tender returnable	Within 12 weeks	5	
			Within 18 weeks	4	
			More than 18 weeks	2	
					20

3.6 TET MEMBER RESPONSIBILITIES

Table 4: TET Member Responsibilities

Mandatory Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
1	X	X	X	X	X
Qualitative Criteria Number	TET 1	TET 2	TET 3	TET 4	TET 5
1	X	X	X	X	X
2	X	X	X	X	X

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.

A. FORESEEN ACCEPTABLE / UNACCEPTABLE QUALIFICATIONS**3.6.1 Risks****Table 4: Acceptable Technical Risks**

Risk	Description
1.	Motor Kw rating lower than the existing

Table 5: Unacceptable Technical Risks

Risk	Description
1.	Inadequate tender returnables.
2.	Mandatory criteria 1 not evaluated and/or satisfied

3.6.2 Exceptions / Conditions**Table 6: Acceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions**

Risk	Description
1.	Declining to provide technical details accurately deemed intellectual proprietary.

Table 7: Unacceptable Technical Exceptions / Conditions

Risk	Description
1.	N/A

4. AUTHORISATION

This document has been seen and accepted by:

Name	Designation
Thabile Modungwa	Electrical Engineering Manager
Sandile Thabethe	Electrical Maintenance Manager
Rhulani Lowani	Mechanical Maintenance Manger
Monyane Mokoena	Auxiliary Plant Engineering Manager

5. REVISIONS

Date	Rev.	Compiler	Remarks
August 2021	1	S. Nene	First Issue

6. DEVELOPMENT TEAM

The following people were involved in the development of this document:

- S. Nene

7. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

N/A

CONTROLLED DISCLOSURE

When downloaded from the EDMS, this document is uncontrolled and the responsibility rests with the user to ensure it is in line with the authorised version on the system.